Daniel G. Bogden 1 United States Attorney District of Nevada 2 Kathryn Newman Andrew W. Duncan 3 Assistant United States Attorney 333 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Suite 5000 4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 702-388-6336 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 7 -oOo-8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Case No. 2:09-CR-132-JAD-GWF 9 Plaintiff 10 STIPULATION TO CONTINUE CALENDAR CALL AND TRIAL VS. 11 (Seventh Request) [1] JEFFREY TURINO, 12 [2] JOHN EDWARDS, [5] MELISSA SPOONER, 13 [8] BRIAN DVORAK, 14 [9] GINGER GUTIERREZ, and [10] JAMES KINNEY, 15 Defendants 16 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the undersigned 17 attorneys, that the calendar call currently scheduled for December 31, 2014 at 9:00 a.m., be 18 vacated and continued to September 8, 2015, at 1:30 p.m. and the Jury Trial currently scheduled 19 for January 6, 2015, be vacated and continued until September 15, 2015. This stipulation is 20 entered into for the following reasons: 21 1. The Court has designated this case as complex. (Docket No. 57.) The defendants 22 need additional time to prepare for trial in this case, including conducting legal research and 23 factual investigation to determine the best respective defenses.

24

///

///

- 2. Defendant John Edwards, who fought extradition from the United Kingdom, made his initial appearance in this district who has not yet made his initial appearance in this District on August 8, 2014. The Court ordered a competency evaluation for Defendant Edwards on October 10, 2014. His counsel estimates that the process will take four months. His counsel needs the additional time to address his competency issues, review discovery and prepare for trial if necessary.
- 3. The voluminous of the case materials, as well as the complex nature of the case, require additional time for the defendants and counsel for the Government to review the materials, conduct legal research and prepare for trial.
- 4. The parties have discussed severance as a case management tool. Defendant Edward's competency is a significant factor in this analysis. The Government requests additional time to allow Defendant Edwards competency to be determined so that it might explore severance further with defense counsel.
  - 5. The additional time requested herein is not sought merely for purposes of delay.
- 6. The defendants do not object to the continuance. Defendant Turino, who is in custody, consents to the continuance.
  - 7. This is the seventh Stipulation to Continue the trial date.
- 8. The additional time requested by this stipulation is excludable in computing the time within which the trial herein must commence pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(6) and (7)(A), when considering the factors under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv).

1	WHEREFORE, the parties stipulate and request that the setting for calendar call and trial	
2	in this case should be vacated, and continued until September 8, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. and	
3	September 15, 2015 at 9:00 a.m., respectively.	
4	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this day of _	2014.
5	Daniel Bogden	
6	United States Attorney	
7	/s/ Kathryn Newman	/s/
8	Kathryn Newman Andrew W. Duncan	John Wesley Hall, Jr. Counsel for Brian Dyorak
9	Assistant United States Attorneys	Counsel for Brian Dvorak
10		/s/
11	/s/	Chris T. Rasmussen Counsel for Ginger Gutierrez
12	Jess R. Marchese Counsel for Jeff Turino	Counsel for Ginger Gutterrez
13	Counsel for Jeff Turmo	/s/
14	/s/	Todd M. Leventhal Counsel for James Kinney
15	Bart Stapert Mace J. Yampolsky	Counsel for Junies Termicy
16	Counsel for Melissa Spooner	
17		/s/
18		Richard Wright Counsel for John Edwards
19		Counsel for John Edwards
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

24

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

-oOo-

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 2:09-CR-132-JAD-GWF

Plaintiff

vs.

[1] JEFFREY TURINO,

- [2] JOHN EDWARDS,
- [5] MELISSA SPOONER,
- [8] BRIAN DVORAK,
- [9] GINGER GUTIERREZ, and
- [10] JAMES KINNEY,

Defendants

#### **ORDER**

THIS MATTER COMES BEFORE THE COURT on the parties' sixth Stipulation to Vacate and Continue Trial Setting in this case.

#### **FINDINGS**

Based on the stipulation of the parties, and good cause appearing therefore, the Court hereby finds that:

1. The Court has designated this case as complex. (Docket No. 57.) The defendants need additional time to prepare for trial in this case, including conducting legal research and factual investigation to determine the best respective defenses.

- 2. Defendant John Edwards, who fought extradition from the United Kingdom, made his initial appearance in this district who has not yet made his initial appearance in this District on August 8, 2014. The Court ordered a competency evaluation for Defendant Edwards on October 10, 2014. His counsel estimates that the process will take four months. His counsel needs the additional time to address his competency issues, review discovery and prepare for trial if necessary.
- 3. The voluminous of the case materials, as well as the complex nature of the case, require additional time for the defendants and counsel for the Government to review the materials, conduct legal research and prepare for trial.
- 4. The parties have discussed severance as a case management tool. Defendant Edward's competency is a significant factor in this analysis. The Government requests additional time to allow Defendant Edwards competency to be determined so that it might explore severance further with defense counsel.
  - 5. The additional time requested herein is not sought merely for purposes of delay.
- 6. The defendants do not object to the continuance. Defendant Turino, who is in custody, consents to the continuance.
  - 7. This is the seventh request for a continuance.
- 8. The additional time requested is not sought for purposes of delay, but merely to allow counsel for defense and the United States time to efficiently and thoroughly prepare for trial in light of the voluminous discovery and complex nature of this case.
  - 9. Denial of this request would result in a miscarriage of justice.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

For all of the above-stated reasons, the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial, since the failure to grant said continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice, would deny the parties sufficient time to prepare for trial, taking into account the exercise of due diligence and the complex nature of the case and voluminous discovery.

The continuance requested by the parties is excludable under the Speedy Trial Act, Title 18, United States Code, Sections 3161(h)(6) and (7)(A), when considering the factors under Title 18, United States Code, Sections 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv).

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the calendar call setting on December 31, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. is vacated and reset for September 8, 2015 at the hour of 1:30 p.m. and the trial setting of January 6, 2015, is vacated and continued to September 15, 2015.

**SO ORDERED** this \_\_\_\_\_ day of November 2014.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE